

**REMARKS**

Claim 1 has been amended, support for which can be found in Examples 1-6 of the specification as filed. Claims 2, 3, 11 and 12 have been amended to more clearly define the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Thus, no new matter has been added. Upon entry of this amendment, which is respectfully requested, Claims 1-14 will be pending.

**Oath/Declaration**

Applicants have reviewed the Examiner's comments. Accordingly, Applicants are filing a corrected Declaration, correcting the filing date of Applicants' foreign priority document, JP 2002/161178 ("JP '178"). In this regard, Applicants note that the correct filing date of JP '178 is June 3, 2002.

In addition, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner acknowledge Applicants' claim for priority and indicate that the certified copies of the priority documents have been received (in this regard, Applicants note that the Image File Wrapper in the PAIR system on the PTO website shows that the certified copies of the priority documents have been received by the PTO).

**Response to Claim Objections**

Claim 2 was objected to as being improper.

Claim 2 has been amended to more clearly define the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim 11 was objected to as being unclear.

Claim 11 has been amended to more clearly define the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

**Response to Claim Rejection Under § 112**

Claim 5 (apparently, Claim 3 based on the reasoning given subsequently by the Examiner) was objected to as being indefinite.

Applicants submit that the term “bridge-free” merely means “knotless.” However, Claim 3 has been amended deleting the term “bridge-free.” Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

### **Response to Claim Rejections Under § 103**

Claims 1-10, 13, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over EP 1 243 677 (“EP ‘677”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,707,916 to Snyder et al.

Claims 1-10, 13, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,018,601 to Yanagisawa et al. in view of Snyder.

Claims 1-10, 13, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Endo et al. (“Structural Characterization of Cup-Stacked-Type Nanofibers with an Entirely Hollow Core”, Applied Physics Letters, 80:70, pp. 1267-1269) in view of Snyder.

Claims 11-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over either EP ‘677, Yanagisawa or Endo in view of Snyder and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,718,781 to Verthe et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse.

As an initial matter, Applicants note that Yanagisawa is the U.S. Patent Document corresponding to EP ‘677.

None of EP ‘677, Snyder, Yanagisawa, Endo or Verthe discloses or suggests 25 to 50 parts by mass of carbon fibers or the effect of such on thermal conductivity. Further, though

Snyder discloses carbon fibrils in the composite, Figs. 1 and 2 of Snyder indicate that the carbon fibrils of Snyder are different from carbon fibers of the present invention.

According to Snyder, the amount of carbon fibrils is determined in view of its reinforcement property. In contrast, according to the present invention, the amount of carbon fiber is determined in view of imparting a high thermal conductivity. Thus, the significance of the amount of carbon fiber in Snyder as compared to that of the present invention is very different.

In addition, Snyder discloses that the amount of carbon fibrils should be smaller (less than 50 parts, preferably less than 25 parts, more preferably less than 10 parts). *See*, col. 3, lines 17-29. Thus, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not achieve the presently claimed amount of carbon fibers in view of Snyder. Therefore, EP '677, Snyder, Yanagisawa, Endo and Verthe fail to render obvious the present claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
Application No.: 10/516,508

Attorney Docket No.: Q85110

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Bruce E. Kramer  
Registration No. 33,725

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 30, 2008